PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 020762WO	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below			
International application No. PCT/US2005/020091	International filing date (day/month/year) 07 June 2005 (07.06.2005)	Priority date (day/month/year) 29 July 2004 (29.07.2004)			
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237					
Applicant QUALCOMM Incorporated					

1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 <i>bis</i> .1(a).				
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.				
		nce to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference eport on patentability (Chapter I) instead.			
3.	This report contains indications re	elating to the following items:			
	Box No. I	Basis of the report			
	Box No. II	Priority			
	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability			
	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention			
	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement			
	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited			
	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application			
	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application			
4.		mmunicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but takes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority			

Date of issuance of this report
30 January 2007 (30.01.2007)

The International Bureau of WIPO
34, chemin des Colombettes
1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70

Date of issuance of this report
30 January 2007 (30.01.2007)

Authorized officer

Athina Nickitas-Etienne
e-mail: pt04@wipo.int

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

rom the NTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTH	HORITY		REC'D 0 5 SEP 2005
To: see form PCT/ISA/220			PCT PCT
		WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORIT (PCT Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1)	
		Date of mailing (day/month/year)	see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International application No. PCT/US2005/020091	International filing date (07.06.2005	day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) 29.07.2004	
International Patent Classification (IPC) o H04B7/26	r both national classification	and IPC	
Applicant QUALCOMM INCORPORATED			
 ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity ☑ Box No. V Reasoned st applicability; ☐ Box No. VI Certain docu 	opinion nment of opinion with reg of invention atement under Rule 43 <i>bi</i> citations and explanation ments cited cts in the international ap	ard to novelty, inversely, invers	entive step and Industrial applicability d to noveity, inventive step or industrial statement
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.			
For further options, see Form I 3. For further details, see notes to			
Name and mailing address of the ISA:		Authorized Office	r

European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Dejonghe, O

Telephone No. +31 70 340-2008



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US2005/020091

-	.—.						
	Во	x N	o. I Basis of the opinion				
1.	Wi the	With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in he language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.					
		ıar	is opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following iguage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search inder Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).				
2.	Wit ned	With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:					
	a. type of material:						
			a sequence listing				
			table(s) related to the sequence listing				
	b. format of material:						
			in written format				
			in computer readable form				
	c. time of filing/furnishing:						
			contained in the international application as filed.				
	١		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.				
	i		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.				
3.		In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.					
4.	Ado	Additional comments:					
	Box No. II Priority						
1.	⊠	The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority does not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where required, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.					
2.		This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.					
3.	Add	lition	al observations, if necessary:				

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

1-34

No:

Claims

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

1-34

No:

Claims

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-34

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V.

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US 6 501 955 B1 (DURRANT RANDOLPH L ET AL) 31 December 2002 (2002-12-31)

D2: US 2002/028655 A1 (ROSENER DOUGLAS K ET AL) 7 March 2002 (2002-03-07)

Document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

A wireless repeater comprising a watermarking module (col. 3, lines 13-21; fig. 2) configured to selectively apply a watermark (col. 9, lines 32-35) to at least one channel in a repeater operating band, a receiver configured to receive a wireless transmission (fig. 2).

From this, the subject-matter of independent claim 1 differs in that:

The receiver is further configured to determine an airlink corresponding to at least a portion of the wireless transmission and generate a control signal base in part on the airlink, said control signal being used to control the selective application of the watermark.

2.1 The subject-matter of claim 1 is therefore novel (Article 33(2) PCT)

The problem to be solved by the present invention may be regarded as:

how to reduce the degradation in signal quality resulting from the watermarking?

2.2 The solution to this problem proposed in claim 1 of the present application is considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the following reasons:

International application No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

PCT/US2005/020091

In D1, it has been acknowledged that some watermarking techniques have detrimental effect on the relayed signal (col. 5, lines 31-35). However D1 does not disclose a repeater suitable for multiple airlinks.

In D2, a repeater suitable for multiple airlinks is disclosed. The airlink is determined based on at least a portion of the wireless transmission (claim 56), however, this airlink determination is used to select some suitable hardware block in the repeater and not for watermarking purposes.

The man in the art would therefore not be incited to combine D1 and D2, and if he would, the combination of D1 and D2 would still not lead to the wireless repeater of claim 1.

- 3 Claims 2-15 are dependent on claim 1 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.
- The same reasoning applies, mutatis mutandis, to the subject-matter of the corresponding independent claims 16, 19, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34, which therefore are also considered new (Article 33(2) PCT) and inventive (Article 33(3) PCT).
- 5 Claims 17 and 18 are dependent on claim 16 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.
- 6 Claims 20-29 are dependent on claim 19 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.